

747 S.S.

THE
REVOLUTION VINDICATED
AND
CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY
ASSERTED.

T H E

REVOLUTIONARY VINCENNES



CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY

ASSERTE

T H E
REVOLUTION VINDICATED,

A N D

CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTY

ASSERTED.

IN ANSWER TO

**The Reverend Dr. WATSON's Accession Sermon,
Preached before the University of Cambridge, on
October 25th, 1776.**

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

**By the Author of Strictures on Dr. WATSON's
Restoration Sermon.**

C A M B R I D G E,

**Printed and fold by J. WOODYER, at Cambridge; D.
PRINCE at Oxford; B. WHITE, T. PAYNE, T.
CADELL, and G. ROBINSON, London. 1777.**

REVOLUTION VINDICATED



I do humbly offer to your Lordship's deliberate thoughts these following considerations concerning the points of Resistance, if our religion and rights should be invaded.

1st. That the Christian religion doth plainly forbid the Resistance of authority.

2dly. That though our religion be established by law, yet in the same law which establishes our religion, it is declared, that it is not lawful upon any pretence whatsoever to take up arms, &c. Besides, that there is a particular law declaring the power of the militia to be solely in the King; and that tyes the hands of subjects, though the law of nature, and the general rules of Scripture had left us at liberty, which I believe they do not, because the government, and peace of human society could not well subsist upon these terms.

Dr. Tillotson's Letter to Lord Russell when under condemnation in Newgate, July 20th, 1683.

Revolution Vindicated, &c.

DEAR SIR,

THE favourable reception the *Strictures* on Dr. WATSON'S *Restoration* Sermon have met with from the public is, as you observe, a strong confirmation of the pleasing truth advanced by him in his dedication, "that the principles maintained in the discourse, have of late become generally unfashionable;" and I flatter myself, that the more those principles are canvassed, the more their unsoundness will appear, and the greater will be the abhorrence of them. The Doctor, however, seems determined not to be in the fashion as yet, if we may judge from the *Accession* Sermon he has published. In nothing terrified, he has set up his banners for tokens; and is not only for breaking

B

down,

down, with his axes and hammers, the carved work of our goodly fabric, he is for destroying the very foundations thereof. His last performance, I agree with you, is no less exceptionable than the former; and in compliance with your repeated solicitations, I have made some remarks on it; which otherwise it was not my intention to have done, the Strictures being, as I thought, a sufficient answer to every thing he could urge in support of his extravagant opinions.

On the reverse of his title page, the Doctor has given us a quotation from Bishop *Hoadly*, by which he would insinuate, that they who now have the heart to defend the Revolution, are for that reason stigmatized as a dangerous sort of men, and that they who so stigmatize them are enemies to the Revolution. The Doctor has here raised an outwork, from whence he expects to play upon us with great advantage, but he will find himself mistaken; it will soon be silenced and turned against him, to his no small annoyance. It is not because the Doctor and his Whig-brethren have the heart to defend the Revolution, but because they have the heart (I had almost

most said, the audacity) to defend it on principles which the Revolution disclaims, and so betray the cause they pretend to support, that they are represented (and very justly too) as a dangerous sort of men by those, who are not *therefore* (as the Doctor would have it understood) enemies to the Revolution, but the real friends of our present happy establishment. We make our boast, that by the Revolution our excellent constitution was preserved to us in its pristine state of health and vigour; but had it proceeded on the principles laid down by the Doctor and his associates in politics, instead of preserving, it had destroyed the constitution; for they ground it on the power of the people, and the right of deposing Kings; whereas, by the undoubted and fundamental laws of this kingdom, prior to the Revolution, it is declared, that “neither the peers of this
 “realm, nor the commons, nor both to-
 “gether, in parliament, or out of parlia-
 “ment, nor the people collectively or re-
 “presentatively, nor any persons whatso-
 “ever, ever had, have, hath, or ought
 “to have, any coercive power over the
 B 2 “ persons

"persons of the Kings of this realm *." This, the wisdom of the Convention saw; and to avoid the breach of the laws, they very judiciously founded the Revolution on the *abdication*, and the *vacancy of the throne*. That the Revolution was established on this footing is clear from the preamble to the act of settlement; and that it abhors the deposing doctrine is no less evident; for not only the laws in being before the Revolution, which absolutely condemn it, remain to this day unrepealed and in full force, but other laws of the same tenor have been enacted since the Revolution. Who then are the best friends to the Revolution? They who defend it on the principles maintained by the Revolution itself, and on which the government actually does subsist, or they who would justify it on principles which the Revolution condemns, and on which no government whatever can subsist?—They who plead for it as preserving, or they who contend for it as subverting the Constitution?—They who distinguish between the Rebellion in 1648, and the Revolution in

* 12 Car. 2.

1688, or they who confound them, and render the latter as odious as the former, the guilt of which (in the emphatic language of our church) nothing less than the blood of the Son of God can expiate? And who are the best friends to the gracious Prince now on the throne? They who, with the law, acknowledge his hereditary right, or they, who in defiance of law allow him no right but their sovereign will? They who reverence him as the minister of God, by whom Kings reign, and to be obeyed for conscience sake; or they who consider him as the creature of the people, dependent on their breath for his very existence, and who, at every turn, arrogantly tell him, that for their pleasure he was created, and at their pleasure he may be annihilated? When there was a project on foot in the latter end of the reign of Queen *Anne*, for introducing the English episcopacy into *Prussia*, and the Electorate of *Hanover*, Mr. *Bonnet* the Prussian Minister at London, in a letter to his master, mentions as a political objection, that it would be matter of triumph to the *Tories*, and give umbrage to the *Whigs*, on whom the house of Hanover principally depended for support.

port. To this it was replied by Doctor *Jablonski*, the King of Prussia's Chaplain, " that the *Tories*, truly and properly so called, were zealous defenders of the house of Hanover, the church and monarchy. On the contrary, under the cloak of whiggism were concealed factions, which, if let alone to strengthen themselves, would not be less dangerous to the house of Hanover than to the church and monarchy." The sagacious *Jablonski* had no difficulty to determine who were friends, and who were enemies to the Revolution and the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover; he saw through the fallacy of *Whig* pretensions, the event has justified his opinion of them, and we at this day, I think, must allow he had an excellent discernment.

The way being so far clear, and the engineer's redoubt turned against him, we may now proceed to the main work, the Sermon itself. The Preacher opens it with the assembling together of the seven Persian nobles, after the massacre of the Magi, to deliberate on the important question—What form of government they should then establish?—He tells us what was said,
or

or might have been said, (for he exceeds the authority of his historian) on the subject by the different nobles, and makes the speaker in favour of a democracy impressed with as *just* an idea " of that equality and " independence, in which the God of nature has produced us all," as if he had been the professor's own pupil. I was afraid indeed, lest his zeal should have tempted him to continue the narration, and urge the story of the stallion, (which might not have been so proper from the pulpit,) as an argument against the divine institution of government; but he prudently stopt short, only observing, that we remembered the issue of the conference; and perhaps after all, he refrained from mentioning the circumstance of a kingdom being obtained by the neighing of an horse, as thinking it would operate not less forcibly against the *human* than against the divine institution of government. If the propriety of the Doctor's prefixing this portion of profane history, to a discourse on the Christian duty of subjection to rulers, should not strike the generality of readers, and the case of David under Saul, or the Jews under the Babylonish captivity be thought

thought more pertinent to the occasion, let them reflect that he makes it introductory to what he thinks a compliment to our own government, and I hope they will be satisfied.

“ Our ancestors, the Doctor says, were
 “ wiser than the nobles of Persia, in the
 “ establishment of our government.”
 They were, and what wonder when we consider their superior advantages? they had the sacred code for their direction, which the others wanted. They were wiser too than some of their descendents; or we had not been blessed “ with statutes
 “ and judgments so righteous as all the
 “ law which is set before us this day.”
 They neglected not the advantages they enjoyed, but proceeded on sure grounds. The frame of our constitution is very different from the Doctor’s idea of it; and to suppose it so weakly constructed, is paying it but an ill compliment. He represents it as of a mixt nature, composed of “ three
 “ several orders, each of them having an
 “ influence too powerful to be trampled
 “ on by either, or by both the others
 “ with impunity.” But in this he is certainly mistaken. It was a doctrine broached
 at

at the time of the grand Rebellion (I hope it is not now brought forward with the same traiterous designs) that the King was a part of the Parliament, and one of the three estates, co-ordinate with the two houses of Lords and Commons; but this doctrine, though vulgarly and almost generally believed, is unknown to our law; for by the law, the three estates of the realm are the Lords spiritual, the Lords temporal, and the Commons, the King not being one of the three estates; but distinct from, and superior to them. Of this we have a convincing proof in the office of our church for the 5th of November, which has the sanction of an act of Parliament; and I am surpris'd the Doctor should not recollect it; for, no doubt, as a friend to the Revolution, he always attends divine service on that day: If he will only turn to the place, he will find that we there bless God, not for preserving the three estates, King, Lords, and Commons, but for preserving the King *and the three estates* of the realm of England assembled in Parliament. And does not the prayer appointed to be read during the session of Parliament speak the same

C

language,

language, where we pray for the High Court of Parliament assembled, not *with*, as *co-ordinate*, but *under* our most religious and gracious King, as *subject* to him. The oath of allegiance is a further evidence of the like truth; and I should think it must be matter of great consolation to the Doctor to hear it. The serving two masters is more than a man can well do; but to have three to serve must be distressing indeed. We do not swear to bear faith and true allegiance to the King and the two houses of Parliament, as our supreme and sovereign Lords, nor is there any treason against the Parliament; but we swear to bear faith and true allegiance to the King, and *him* we are to defend to the utmost of our power, against all traiterous conspiracies and attempts whatsoever, which shall be made against his person, crown, or dignity. And to put the matter out of all doubt, that the two houses of Lords and Commons are not the sovereign authority, but our fellow-subjects, we have their own testimony for it; they style themselves his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, and take oaths of allegiance to him; asserting him to be the only supreme

preme governor in all causes, and over all persons. The Doctor's mixture of three supreme dependent powers shaken together, each at the same time superior and inferior, controuling and controuled by one another, is a mixture that can agree with no constitution, but must inevitably bring on convulsions, and end in the dissolution of the body politic, wherever it is administered. Of such a system *Tacitus* might well remark; that if it ever happened to be established in the world, it would not continue long: and the English history has not, as the Doctor suggests, rendered suspicious this observation of *Tacitus*; for of the English government, it cannot be affirmed, that it is so constituted.

“ As nothing, (the Doctor thinks) can contribute more to the stability of the state than a clear comprehensive view of the relation which subsists between the people and those whom they have appointed for their governors, having on a late occasion enlarged on the rights, he now proceeds to explain the duties of the people.” The Doctor you see, is steady; though reason, scripture, history, experience are all against him, he persists in his opinion, that go-

vernors are appointed by, and derive their authority from the people. However, in the judgment of others, he may have been confuted, he certainly is not convinced. If he were, he would confess it; we have his own word for it, in his letters to Mr. Gibbon, that he is "not backward to acknowledge his mistakes when convinced that he is in an error;" to convince him of his error, is the difficulty, *hic labor, hoc opus*; accomplish that point, let conviction take place, and confession will soon follow. A comprehensive view of the relation between the people and their governors, the Doctor observes must contribute greatly to the stability of the state; but for this purpose it is necessary that the view be just, otherwise, instead of contributing to the stability, it may operate to the destruction of the state. To say that parents are the appointment of their children, and have no authority over them without their consent first asked and obtained, would not, I apprehend, be giving a just view of the relation between them; nor would such a view contribute much to the peace and happiness of the family. As little consonant to truth, and as little conducive to the

the stability of the state is the representation, that governors are the appointment of the people, and that no laws are binding on the people, to which they have not consented. "He who goeth about to persuade a multitude, that they are not so well governed as they ought to be, will never want attentive and favourable hearers;" and he who persuades the people, that they have a right, when they think they are not well governed, to put down one and set up another ruler, will find them ready at every turn to assert that right, and disposed to resist, when it is their duty to obey. But let us see what the Doctor has to offer on the subject. As he *enlarged* so much on the *rights* of the people, it will be well, if in explaining their *duties*, he does not in a manner *explain* them all away.

"The first duty which subjects owe to the civil magistrate (as the Doctor observes) is obedience. And the Christian religion, (he says) has been thought by some to enjoin *unlimited* obedience." But he should have told us by whom, for I never heard of any who maintained it. If by *unlimited*, he means *passive obedience*, which

which I suspect he does from his using the term as synonymous to *non-resistance*, I am sorry, that a master in Israel should not know these things better. There is surely an essential difference between obeying unlawful commands, implied by *unlimited* obedience, and patient suffering for not obeying them, which is, properly speaking, *passive obedience*. To charge the maintainers of that doctrine with asserting, that the Christian religion enjoins us "to obey man rather than God," which he here actually does, is bringing an evil report against them with a witness; but it is as false as the report of the spies against the Holy Land; and I hope the Doctor will not only be convinced of, but readily acknowledge his error, in this respect at least, whatever he may do in others. Though, indeed, as to the doctrine of non-resistance, even in its genuine sense, the Professor does not know how to be reconciled to it. He cannot think that the Christian religion takes from mankind "that liberty of resistance, in extreme cases, which the very frame of our nature demands as an inalienable right, and which the voice of reason

reason as well as of humanity allows^{ed}. But if the doctrine of non-resistance is to be rejected because repugnant to our na-

* There are numbers of people, I doubt not, who have a just abhorrence of the seditious principles of Doctor Price, and yet see no harm in our author's maintaining the right of resistance in extreme cases. To such, let me recommend the serious consideration of the following note in Doctor Price's *Additional Observations on the Nature and Value of Civil Liberty*, p. 22. subjoined to a complimentary note on Doctor Watson's Sermon, entitled, *The Principles of the Revolution vindicated*. "Some (says he) who maintain this doctrine concerning government (viz. a right in the few to govern the many independently of their own choice) overthrow their own system by acknowledging the right of resistance in certain cases. For, if there is such a right, the people must be judges when it ought to be exercised; a right to resist only when civil governors think there is reason, being a gross absurdity and nullity.—The right of resistance, therefore, cannot mean less than a right in the people, whenever they think it necessary, to change their governors, and to limit their power. And from the moment this is done, government becomes the work of the people, and governors become their trustees or agents". A due attention to this note of Doctor Price's may shew the necessity of insisting on the

tute, we may, upon the same principle, reject all the distinguishing doctrines of the gospel. Mortification and self-denial are doctrines by no means agreeable to flesh and blood. Taking up the cross, the indispensable condition of being Christ's disciple, is rather irksome to the frame of corrupt nature, which prefers ease to suffering, and continually demands what the gospel denies. To part with houses and lands, honours and preferments, and with life itself also, are "extreme cases," in which many professors of Christianity beg to be excused complying with the rule of the gospel. But as these doctrines are nevertheless the doctrines of the gospel, so the Christian religion may take from mankind the liberty of resistance, though the frame of corrupt nature demand it, as an inalienable right; and the word of God may forbid, what the voice of depraved reason allows. The Doctor, however, has taken some pains to shew, that non-resistance

the doctrine of non-resistance; for, let our author's principle of the right of resistance in certain cases be once admitted, and all the extravagancies of Doctor Price's system of civil liberty will follow of course.

ance is not a scripture doctrine, with what success we shall soon be able to judge.

In the opinion of the Professor, the doctrine of Non-Resistance has been principally founded upon a distorted interpretation of some few passages in the Epistles. His business, therefore, is to set that straight, which he apprehends has been made crooked. His first Essay for this purpose, is with the 13th chapter of the Epistle to the Romans; and it is surprising to see how he labours to render the whole passage flexible and obedient to his will. To understand fully the weight, and tendency of the Apostle's reasoning in that place, he thinks it necessary to consider the particular circumstances of the persons to whom the Epistle was addressed; and he does it in such an extraordinary manner, as cannot fail to convince us, that there is scarce any thing to which he is not equal.

“ About six years before St. Paul
 “ wrote to the Christians at Rome, the
 “ emperor Claudius,” as the Dr. informs
 us, “ had banished the Jews from that
 “ city, for raising continual tumults
 D “ against

" against the state, *impulsore Chresto*." The
 learned differ as to the meaning of *Sue-*
tonius's expression, *impulsore Chresto*; but
 to the Doctor it seems most probable, " that
 " the Jews, in becoming Christians, had
 " shewn a disposition to rebel against
 " government, from the notion of Jesus
 " as the anointed of God, being the long
 " expected Prince, who was to overcome
 " the Romans, and to redeem Israel."
 Now, of all the most probables I ever
 met with, this seems to me one of the
 most improbable. That the Jews, in
 becoming subjects of the Prince of Peace,
 should shew a disposition to rebel against
 the government, under which they lived,
 is surely not at all likely. That they,
 who rejected Christ in expectation of a
 temporal Messiah, did raise continual
 tumults against the state is true; but that
 they, who believed in him, and knew
 that his kingdom was not of this world,
 should not, in taking up the Cross, lay
 down their arms, is hardly to be sup-
 posed; and when we consider the quiet,
 retired character of the primitive Chris-
 tians, we must, I think, conclude with
 the author of a late work, entitled an
 Apology

Apology for Christianity, &c. that "Men, such as these, would have made but poor Conspirators *." As to the question proposed by the Apostles to Christ, the day he ascended, *Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?* whatever might then be their notion of the Messiah's kingdom, it is evident from their discourses, after they had received the promise of the father, (which they waited for at Jerusalem, not in plotting against the State, but in prayer and supplication) that they were so instructed in the nature of it, as not to look upon the Messiah as a temporal Prince to free them from the Roman yoke, but as an almighty Saviour sent to deliver them from the bondage of Sin, and the power of Satan. Neither was that declaration which was made, when a cloud received him out of their sight, that he would so come in like manner, as they had seen him go into heaven, interpreted by them into any expectation, sufficient, (as the Doctor would have it) to excite the jealousy of the Roman state, for instead of

* See p. 189.

representing the time of his return as near at hand, they declare, that *the heaven must receive him, until the times of the restitution of all things*; that is, till the last day, when he shall come again, in like manner as he went, in the clouds of Heaven, to judge the world, and every eye shall see him. And how the prejudices of the Jews, who rejected Christ as an impostor, because he did not appear in the character of a temporal Messiah, could interpret into any expectation at all, the declaration of *his coming again*, in whom they did not believe, requires a sagacity not inferior to the Doctor's to comprehend. That the redemption St. Peter preached in his first sermon on the day of Pentecost was not temporal, but spiritual; and regarded as such by the three thousand souls who were converted, he that runs may read; for when they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the Apostles, *men and brethren, what shall we do?* Peter did not say unto them, raise tumults, for Messiah, your temporal Saviour, cometh; but *repent, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the re-*
mission

mission of sin, not for deliverance from the Roman yoke, *and ye shall receive*—what? the riches and honours of this world; no, but *the gift of the Holy Ghost*, and the kingdom of God. They, who gladly received this word, were baptized, and continued, as we find, in the Apostle's doctrine, which the Professor need not be told, was that of obedience and submission, of peace and quietness, of humility and meekness; and how such men, as was observed before, could shew any disposition to conspire against, or disturb the government of Cæsar, it is hard to conceive.

The Dr. further remarks; “ that the
 “ received maxim amongst the Jews, that
 “ the Messiah would free them from the
 “ Roman yoke, was the principle by which
 “ many false Christs were continually ex-
 “ citing tumults in Judea; and which in-
 “ duced the Jews to begin that rebellion,
 “ which ended in the destruction of their
 “ city, and their civil polity;” and to him
 “ it does not appear an unreasonable
 “ conjecture to suppose, that the same opi-
 “ nion had operated in the same manner
 “ upon the minds of those, who acknow-
 “ ledged

“ ledged Jesus to be the true Messiah.”
 Indeed! why, they who acknowledged
 Jesus to be the true Messiah, received
 him as *the anointed of God, sent, not to*
deliver them from the Roman yoke, but
to bless them by turning them from their
iniquities; but they who followed false
 Messiahs looked for freedom from the
 Roman yoke only, and not from the do-
 minion of sin. The true Christ com-
 manded his disciples to put up the sword,
 and not resist lawful authority, telling
 them, that *all they that take the sword,*
shall perish by the sword; but the false
 Christs enjoined theirs to draw, not put up
 the sword, and excited them to rebellion
 against Cæsar. How then can it be said,
 that the expectation of a temporal Saviour
 to redeem them from Roman bondage,
 was the same, and had operated in the
 same manner on the minds of those who
 acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah,
 and those who acknowledged him not?
 To the Doctor it may appear not an unrea-
 sonable conjecture to suppose, that the
 principles, and practices of unbelieving
 Jews, and believing Christians, were alike;
 but

but to every considerate person, who has no favourite point to carry by such supposition, the direct contrary must appear; for "what concord hath Christ with Belial, or he that believeth, with an infidel?"

However, "be this as it may," let us not despair; if one probable will not stand, we can but try another. The Doctor says, "we are certain, at least from the testimony of Josephus, that the whole nation of the *Jews*, had become infected with the seditious principles of Judas the Gaulonite, who taught that it was not lawful to acknowledge submission to any earthly governor, or pay tribute to the Romans." But what is that to the *Christians*? A great deal in the Doctor's opinion; for St. Paul seems, as he thinks, "in his Epistle to the Christians at Rome, to have had a particular view to refuting these tenets, for an adherence to which, probably, the *Jews* and *Christians* had been banished the city." And does he really believe it probable, that the Christians did adhere to the seditious principles of Judas the Gaulonite? This is justifying all the Heathen persecutions

cutions of them, for if they were guilty of raising tumults and seditions, they deserved what they suffered. Surely the Doctor has taken a leaf out of Mr. Gibbon's book, and tacked it to his Sermon by mistake. A *Lysias*, the chief captain, might ask an Apostle, *Art not thou that Egyptian, which before these days madest an uproar, and leddest out into the wilderness four thousand men that were murderers?* But for a doctor of divinity, a guide of the blind, an instructor of the ignorant, not to distinguish between unbelieving Jews, and believing Christians, Oh! tell it not in Gath. Thou that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? That the Jews persecuted with unrelenting fury, the Professors of the Christian religion, as well as Christ himself the founder of it, and were industrious to represent them as enemies to Cæsar and his government, is evident from the Scriptures of the New Testament and Ecclesiastical History; and it is well observed from Origen by the learned Apologist before quoted, "that the
 " Jews, in the very beginning of Christian-
 " ity, were the authors of all those calum-
 " nies

"nies which Celsus afterwards took such
 "great delight in urging against the
 "Christians * ;" but that the charge was
 most malicious and unjust, is not less evi-
 dent from the inconsistency of it, with
 the gospel precepts, which they so strictly
 practised. When the doctrines of Jesus,
 and the principles of Judas, are as oppo-
 site as light and darkness, where is the
 probability, that the disciples of the for-
 mer should adhere to the tenets of the
 latter ?

And after all, why this attempt of the
 Doctor's to rob the primitive Christians
 of that name, which "is better than
 "ointment?" Why this endeavour to
 despoil them of that robe of innocence,
 which they purchased at the hazard, and
 not seldom at the expence of their lives ?
 Admitting that the Apostle had in view
 the refutation of the seditious principles of
 Judas the Gaulonite, was it at all more
 necessary to his argument to conclude,
 that they, to whom he wrote, were
 infected with them, than to suppose from
 the precept, to "owe no man any thing,"

* See p. 190.

that they all shewed a disposition to run in debt? Or would it be proper to infer, that we are to lay but little stress on what the Apostle says, because he had a *particular reason for saying it*; which is plainly the whole drift of the Doctor's commentary? Whether they were, or were not seditiously affected, is not the doctrine the same—that *every soul is to be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God—that the powers that be, are ordained of God—that whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God—and that they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation*? Yes certainly; but it suited the Doctor's purpose better to have it thought otherwise; because if they were refractory members of society, propagating opinions destructive of all government, then in their punishment they only received the due reward of their deeds, and the Apostle might, on the Doctor's principles, enjoin them to take it patiently; but if they were persecuted for righteousness sake, the enforcing obedience to their oppressive Rulers in such strong terms, and under such severe penalties, would look like preaching Non-resistance;

sistance; and the Doctor, you know, is engaged to present the Apostle to our view an immaculate *Whig*, washed clean from every foul imputation of *Toryism*. His zeal for the *good old cause*, not any real ill-will towards the primitive Christians, I dare believe, tempted him to bring this railing accusation against them, and that must be his apology with the candid, unless my learned friend, the Author of Letters to Mr. Gibbon, to whom I am much obliged for some excellent remarks, will write a better for him. If the Doctor expected any great advantage to his cause, from the unfavourable representation he has given of the Christians in those days, he must surely be disappointed; and perhaps what he has farther to advance in support of it, may not be attended with better success.

One design of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Christians at Rome was, the Doctor thinks, "to refute the tenets of Judas and
 "his followers, who held it unlawful to
 "acknowledge submission to any earthly
 "governor, the Lord Jehovah being their
 "only Lord, or to pay tribute to the Ro-
 "mans." In opposition to these erroneous

opinions, " the Apostle expressly informs
 them," as the Doctor observes, " that
 " there was no civil power but of God,
 " that all powers were ordained of God,
 " that Rulers were God's Ministers, and
 " that tribute was to be paid to them as
 " to the Ministers of God ;" all which he
 looks upon as equivalent to saying, " it was
 " a great error in them to rebel against the
 " state, and refuse paying tribute, from a
 " persuasion of the unlawfulness of submit-
 " ting to a heathen magistrate, or acknow-
 " ledging a human governor; for every civil
 " government, though not particularly ap-
 " pointed as the Jewish, was providentially
 " ordained by God for the benefit of man-
 " kind; to do them good, by being a terror
 " to evil works; and heathen magistrates
 " had a right to expect tribute from them
 " for attending continually upon that very
 " thing, the punishment of their vices, and
 " the protection of their innocence." By
 this judicious paraphrase, which, you see,
 fully preserves the spirit of the text, at
 the same time that it throws great light
 upon the subject, the Doctor, without
 doubt, would fain convince us, that it
 was by no means the Apostle's intention
 abso-

absolutely to deny the legality of resistance. He asserts, indeed, the lawfulness of submission in general, to human governors, against the error of those, who held it unlawful to submit to any at all; but that is very different from maintaining that they are in no case to be resisted. On the contrary, does not he himself prescribe the *measures* of submission, when, after declaring that all powers were ordained of God, he says, that Rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil, and are the ministers of God to us for good? Is not this clearly pointing out to us, who are the ordinance of God, and who are to be obeyed as such? When Rulers, instead of being a terror to evil, are a terror to good works, and instead of being ministers to us for good, are ministers for evil, do they not cease to be the ordinance of God, and are they not then to be resisted? Government, if administered for the benefit of mankind, the end of its institution, is to be obeyed as the ordinance of God; if abused to their destruction, it is to be resisted as no longer having the sanction of divine authority. Such is
the

the substance of the interpretation put on the Apostle by the Doctor, in favour of Resistance, and in conformity to the system of Bishop Hoadly; and what more could he have done that he has not done to make a complete *Whig* of him? But with what propriety, let us now consider.

Whether St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans had it in view to refute the tenets of any particular person or not, it is manifest, that he inculcates the duty of subjection to government, as the ordinance of God, in the strongest terms; he does not say in the lax style of his paraphrast, "it is a
 " great error to raise tumults and seditions
 " from a persuasion of the unlawfulness
 " of submitting to heathen magistrates," nor does he grant indulgences for disobedience in cases of mal-administration; no, he represents rebellion as a sin of the deepest die, he considers resisting government, which is the ordinance of God, as resisting God himself; and declares, that *they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation*; without the least intimation as I can perceive, that governors are to be obeyed no longer than while we think they are upright

upright and act according to law. As to
 " rulers being not a terror to good works
 " but to the evil, and the ministers of God
 " to us for good," on which the Doctor
 lays so great stress, I apprehend it will in
 no wise favour his scheme. Government
 without doubt, was ordained for the bene-
 fit of mankind, and if it is to be obeyed
 so long as it answers that end, it must al-
 ways be obeyed ; for it is never so badly
 administered as not to be preferable to
 anarchy ; and the many blessings constantly
 derived from it to the community in ge-
 neral, infinitely outweigh the evils parti-
 cular persons may sometimes suffer from
 it. The people are better in any hands
 than their own, and the cruellest tyrant is
 a miracle of mercy when compared with
 the people set free from all restraint, and
 let loose one upon another, as they are at
 present in America ; and I have no doubt
 but that the loyal party of that country,
 harrassed, plundered, persecuted, and pro-
 scribed, as they have been and now are in
 many places, are convinced of this doctrine
 by woful experience. But supposing rulers
 should deviate from the line of their duty,
 and not fulfil the design of their appoint-
 ment,

ment, do they therefore cease to be the ministers of God? Is man less the creature of God because by his folly he defeats the gracious intention of his maker in creating him? We learn from Scripture, that God maketh a wicked man to reign for the sins of the people, so that the wickedness of the ruler is no proof that he is not the ordinance of God, nor that the divine counsels may not be accomplished by him. The professor strenuously contends, that a failure in duty amounts to a forfeiture of authority, but is he quite sure that he would wish this doctrine to prevail in all cases? In regard, however, to the passage under consideration, it is plain, that the Apostle is describing the duty of governors, without supposing they will not, though they ought not to transgress the rule; for the rulers, of whom he speaks, persecuted the Christians, and put them to all manner of tortures, not for being rebels, but for being Christians; so that unless christianity was not a good work (at the very supposition of which, the Doctor must shudder) the Roman emperors, when they persecuted it, were a terror to good works. And yet notwithstanding this, they did not, in
the

the opinion of the Apostle, cease to be the ordinance of God; for of these powers, which then were, does he assert, that they are ordained of God, and to them does he command every soul to be subject, forbidding resistance upon pain of damnation. Seeing then, that the Apostle declares—all power is of God, and enjoins Christians to yield subjection to Heathen rulers, as the ordinance of God, even when persecuting them to death for no other crime than their faith in Christ, I think, we may fairly conclude, that the Doctor was mistaken in his man, and had a harder task than he was aware of, when he thought to make a *Whig* of St. Paul.

“ If, (says the Doctor) we have rightly
 “ explained the occasion of writing this
 “ famous passage, we may see with what
 “ little reason some men have thence built
 “ their servile system of *unlimited* (he will
 “ know better another time, he should have
 “ said *passive*) obedience;” but “ if we have
 “ not,” (and proof enough has been given,
 I believe, that the Doctor has not) rightly
 explained it, why, then we see no such
 thing; on the contrary we see, that the
 Doctor is only kicking against the pricks
 in attempting to overthrow a system built

F

on

on the foundation of Prophets and Apostles, Christ Jesus himself, the chief corner stone. St. Paul "is addressing himself," the Doctor says, "to a very inconsiderable" part of the inhabitants of the greatest "city then in the world;" but surely not to them only, he addresses them as Christians, and the Epistle was intended for the instruction of the church in all ages and places, for "no scripture is of private interpretation." The spirit of God in dictating to the Apostle had respect to the latter days, no less than the time then present; he foresaw there would arise men of perverse minds, speaking proud things, and saying, all power is of the people, who is lord over us? and for our admonition, who live in the dregs of time, when such pernicious tenets are broached even from the pulpits, and greedily swallowed by some people, was it written, *let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God.* The Doctor indeed, can discover at once the duty of a conscientious obedience to those, who are "the ministers of God to us for good;" and that it seems is as much as he can discover; though one should have thought from the

the

the circumstance of the Apostle's enjoining obedience to a *Caligula*, a *Claudius*, a *Nero*, he might have discovered something more, even the duty of a conscientious obedience to those who are "the ministers of God to us," whether for good, or evil. He cannot discover, that "the Apostle had any intention of laying an obligation upon the Senate, and the whole people of Rome, if they should ever become Christians, to stretch out the neck and wait with submissive expectation, till some haughty tyrant had struck it off;" perhaps not, but he might have discovered, that the Apostle "stretched out" his own neck, "waiting the stroke with submissive expectation;" and, as he exhorts his Christian brethren to be followers of him, and walk as they have him for an ensample, had the senate of Rome been converted to the faith, and had the providence of God brought them into similar circumstances with *St. Paul*, I think we may discover, that it would have been their duty to "do likewise." Where the Doctor discovered, what I believe nobody else ever did, that in preaching the doctrine of non-resistance, the Apostles precept had

contradicted his practice, I cannot guess, unless it was, when he "resisted unto blood;" but that is a liberty of resistance, which the frame of our nature, I apprehend the Doctor will allow, does not demand as an inalienable right.

The Doctor's next experiment is with *St. Peter*. And as he before endeavoured to elude the force of *St. Paul's* argument against resistance, by limiting the ordinance of God to good governors only, so now he has recourse to another expedient for the support of his crazy fabric, and represents *St. Peter* speaking of government, not as the ordinance of God, but of the people. Both Apostles, he tells us, insist on the same doctrine of obedience to civil magistrates, but their motives to it are not derived from the same principle. *St. Peter*, having nothing to do with those portentous Gaulonite Christians, which have given the Doctor and me so much trouble, had no occasion, it seems, to consider government as the ordinance of God, which *St. Paul* was obliged to do, to serve the present turn, but as instituted by man; *submit yourselves*, says he, *to every ordinance of man*. Not that we are therefore to suppose

pose any contradiction between the Apostles; no, certainly; they both mean the same thing; for, according to the Doctor, whether government be of divine, or human institution, the rulers are to be obeyed no longer than while they, who are to obey them, and for whose benefit they were appointed, think they act for the public, that is, their private good. But really, notwithstanding the Doctor's assurance to the contrary, if one Apostle speaks of government as the ordinance of God, and the other as the ordinance of man, there is such an essential difference between them, that I do not see how they are to be reconciled. When St. Paul declares, *the powers that be are ordained of God*, it must imply, that the authority is divine, for the Apostle could not mean that the Roman government was of his particular appointment; but to say, in contradistinction to St. Paul, as St. Peter is supposed by the Doctor to do, that it is the ordinance of man, is making the authority merely human; and how then can it be said, there is no contradiction between them? Though indeed the question with me is, Whether St. Peter does assert government

vernment to be instituted by man in the sense the Doctor intimates, or in any sense the least different from St. Paul; nay rather, it is clear to me, he does not; nor would there have been the shadow of a pretence for such supposition, had the passage before us been rendered, as I apprehend it very well might have been*, *Submit yourselves to every human constitution, or government*; and had the Doctor added what follows in the text, *for the Lord's sake*; for then it had been evident, the authority was divine, though the government human, the language of St. Peter would have appeared uniformly the same with that of St. Paul, *let every soul be subject to the higher powers, for there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God*, and the two Apostles would have been found to derive the motive to obedience not from a different principle, as the Doctor suggests, but from one and the same principle.

However various the forms of government may be, and however differently

* See the Reverend Mr. Parkhurst's Greek and English Lexicon, on the word *ἐξουσία*, an incomparable work, which might be of great service to the Doctor in his theological studies.

consti-

constituted, the authority of them all is from God, and not from the people. The power of life and death, necessarily resident in all governments is an undoubted proof of it. The people cannot give this power, for they have it not. No man hath power over his own life, and how then can any man give that to another, which he himself has not? This power is to be derived from God alone; he only, who gave, hath a right to dispose of life, and the sword in the hand of the ruler is the sword of God. It is so, even in elective states, where the people (improperly so called) have the choice of the rulers, for the authority of the rulers is no more derived from the electors because they chose them, than the authority of the husband from the wife, or of the master from the servant, for the same reason. The choice of the husband is from the wife, and of the master from the servant, and the choice of the rulers in such states is from the people, but the authority is not from them, it is from God. They were each of them free as to their choice, but after choice made, they are not free as to their duty; and as the wife cannot disobey the husband, nor the

the servant the master, so neither the people their rulers, without disobeying God, who hath made the husband the head of his wife, *as Christ is the head of the church*, the master, lord over his servants, *whom they are to count worthy of all honour, and be obedient unto them, as unto Christ*, and hath commanded the people every where *to be subject to powers and principalities, and to obey magistrates*. "Christianity," the Doctor observes, "enforces civil obedience, which the law of nature points out, by new penalties;" and it enforces, let me observe, such obedience, as the law of nature points not out, and the natural man cannot brook; it orders us to *be subject—not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward, and when we suffer for well-doing, to take it patiently, as acceptable with God*.

We have now seen what the Doctor has to offer on the duty of obedience to civil magistrates; and from his manner of handling the subject, may we not ask, Is he for or against it? he is so fearful of administering occasion to that implicit obedience paid by the people to their rulers, which, you know, is the disease of the times, and

to

to which human nature is so prone, that he is more earnest to maintain the right of resistance than to insist on the duty of obedience; and it must be confessed, that whoever makes the Doctor's measure of submission the rule of his conduct towards his governors, is in no danger of offending through excess of deference to authority. He says, indeed, that the doctrine of non-resistance is founded upon distorted interpretations of scripture; but surely, in all the ten persecutions, never were poor Christians so tortured as the two Apostles have been by the Doctor, in order to extort from them the contrary doctrine; they, nevertheless, as we see, persevere in their confession, that they are Christians, and "are not ashamed to suffer reproach for the name of Christ." The Doctor may express his surprise, that the Christian religion should be thought by any to enjoin passive obedience; but when he finds how many have thought it, and who they are, perhaps his surprise may be still greater.

Christ Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, taught his disciples *not to resist evil, but to pray for them that despitefully used and persecuted them*; and the doctrine he

G

taught,

taught, he illustrated by his own example. *Before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession, and acknowledged the authority of the Roman governor to be given him from above, even when passing sentence against him unjustly. Though he might have commanded twelve legions of Angels to his defence, he patiently endured the contradiction of sinners, and was led like a lamb to the slaughter; they condemned and killed the just, and he did not resist them.*

“ The glorious company of the Apostles” were steadfast and unmoveable in this doctrine, always abounding in the work of the Lord. The duty of subjection for conscience sake, which they preached to others, they practised themselves. *When suffering for well-doing, they took it patiently, as being called thereunto, Christ having suffered for them, and left them an example, that they should follow his steps. For his sake they were killed all the day long, they were as sheep appointed for the slaughter; and they rejoiced that they were counted worthy to suffer for his holy name.*

“ The goodly fellowship of the Prophets” proclaimed aloud, *who can stretch forth*

forth his hand against the Lord's anointed, and be guiltless; and they are held forth as examples of suffering affliction and of patience.

“ The noble army of Martyrs” followed the Apostles, as they followed the Lamb; they bore witness to the same truth, and sealed it with their blood. We are taught (says *Polycarp* to the president, who had commanded him to swear by the emperor's genius in the name of the Christians) “ We
“ are taught to yield obedience to all
“ principalities and powers ordained under
“ God, except in doing things, which are
“ destructive of our souls: therefore do as
“ thou plearest, cast me to the wild
“ beasts, or into the fire, which is not to be
“ compared to that eternal fire, which thou
“ knowest not to be reserved for the un-
“ godly at the last judgment.” “ We
“ (says *Cyprian*) are become a very numer-
“ ous people, and the greater part of the
“ empire, yet not a man of us does resist,
“ when apprehended, nor revenge the in-
“ juries we endure.”

“ The holy church throughout all the
“ world,” acknowledged this doctrine, as
the ancient liturgies with one consent de-
clare; and that the church of England to
this day professeth the same faith, her ar-

G 2
ticles,

ticles, canons, homilies, and liturgy sufficiently evince. In her articles she maintains, " that the King's majesty hath the
 " chief power in this realm of England,
 " and other his dominions, unto whom
 " the chief government of all estates of
 " this realm, whether they be ecclesiasti-
 " cal, or civil, in all causes doth apper-
 " tain; and is not, nor ought to be subject
 " to any foreign jurisdiction;" by which she excludes no less the power of the people than of the Pope; for if the Pope, who pretended to a divine right, had no power over kings, much less have the people, who pretend to an inferior right only, the right of compact. And in her canons she declares, " that the King's power
 " within his realms is the highest power
 " under God," (consequently not accountable to, nor resistible by the people) " to
 " whom all men, as well inhabitants, as
 " born within the same, do by Gods laws
 " owe most loyalty and obedience." In her homilies she is no less express, that
 " Christ taught us plainly, that even the
 " wicked rulers have their power and au-
 " thority from God; and therefore it is
 " not lawful for their subjects to with-
 " stand

“ stand them, although they abuse their
 “ power.—“ If they command us to do
 “ any thing contrary to Gods command-
 “ ment, in such a case, we ought to say
 “ with the Apostle, *we must rather obey*
 “ *God than man*, but nevertheless, in that
 “ case we may not in any wise withstand
 “ violently, or rebel against rulers, or
 “ make any insurrection, sedition, or tu-
 “ muls, either by force of arms, or other-
 “ wise, against the anointed of the Lord,
 “ or any of his appointed officers, but we
 “ must in such case patiently suffer all
 “ wrongs and injuries, referring the judg-
 “ ment of our cause only to God.” And
 in her liturgy, she acknowledges “ God
 “ (not the people) to be the only ruler of
 “ princes ;” that the King is God’s mini-
 ster, and the people’s sovereign ; and di-
 rects us to pray, that “ all his subjects duly
 “ considering whose authority he hath,
 “ may faithfully serve, honour, and hum-
 “ bly obey him according to God’s blessed
 “ word and ordinance,” since to rebel
 against him would be fighting against
 God, whose name he bears, and by whose
 power he acts.

Nor does the church only maintain
 this

this doctrine, it is uniformly the doctrine of the state also; for not to mention that the articles, homilies, &c. being ratified by Acts of Parliament, are a part of the law of the land, and the doctrines of the state, as well as of the church; nor to mention many other acts which are express for Non-resistance, the act establishing the abjuration oath, which requires
 “ all persons in office to swear to defend
 “ the King to the uttermost of their
 “ power, against all traiterous conspi-
 “ racies and attempts whatsoever, which
 “ shall be made against his person, crown,
 “ or dignity;” and to make this declaration, “ heartily, willingly, and truly,
 “ upon the true faith of a Christian,” is full to the point; for resistance cannot be agreeable to this abjuration, as to resist is not the way to defend.

And to complete this collection of testimonies in favour of Non-resistance, I will produce one more, which, perhaps, the Doctor may not suspect; but I trust it will be decisive with him, as it is the authority of “ a friend who sticketh closer
 “ than a brother,” of no less a person than the REGIUS PROFESSOR of *Divinity*
 in

in the University of Cambridge, who hath subscribed *ex animo* to the King's supremacy, in all causes, and over all persons, and to the Common Prayer, as well as the articles of religion, which contain this doctrine.

Seeing then, we are encompassed with so great a cloud of witnesses, and supported by such authorities, the Professor himself bringing up the rear, I think we may conclude, without suspicion of singularity, or danger of error, that “ *passive*
 “ *obedience* is a doctrine which shines
 “ with as high and flaming an evidence
 “ throughout the whole New Testament,
 “ as the very history of our Saviour's life
 “ does, which was a kind of comment
 “ upon it. For the Christian religion,
 “ both in itself, and in its author, is a
 “ *suffering religion*, a religion *teaching*
 “ *suffering*, *injoining* suffering, and *re-*
 “ *warding* suffering; and to express all
 “ in a word, it was *Christ's passive obedience*
 “ which redeemed the world; and for
 “ any one who wears the name of a
 “ Christian to scoff at, or write against
 “ it, and at the same time to look to be
 “ saved

“ saved by it, is certainly very strange and
 “ preposterous, and too much in all
 “ conscience for any, but such Professors
 “ of Christianity, as live and practise in a
 “ direct defiance of their profession*.”

† As to the objection, that passive obedience, or non-resistance is a slavish degenerate principle, ministering to the purposes of tyranny and oppression, it is a great mistake; and when we consider, that the doctrine is of God, it is representing the Father of mercies, as the parent of cruelty, which is exceedingly impious. Supposing the wisdom and propriety of the divine law, exacting such submission should not be obvious to our narrow comprehension, we ought to acquiesce in it with all humility, as knowing it must be holy, just, and good. Whatever evils our sagacity may apprehend from the law, all the possible inconveniences of it must have been manifest

* Dr. South.

† See a Discourse on the English Constitution, extracted from a late eminent writer, and applicable to the present times. Printed for G. Robinson, Pater-noster-Row, London.

to the law-giver, for " the foolishness of
 " God is wiser than men ;" and we may
 be assured, as " he doth not willingly
 " afflict nor grieve the children of men,"
 that the observance of it would not be
 made our duty, were it not at the same
 time our happiness. That this precept
 has a view to the welfare of society in
 general, I think, must be apparent to any
 one, who considers it with the least at-
 tention. Passive obedience instead of
 being a slavish degenerate principle, is
 certainly a principle of liberty and se-
 curity ; for how can we be free and safe
 from the oppression of powerful neigh-
 bours, or the outrages of lawless robbers,
 unless we live under a government with
 sufficient power to keep the peace and
 protect us ? And how can a government be
 able to protect *us*, which is not able to
 defend *itself* ; which it is not, if it is re-
 sistible ; for government resistible, is no
 government at all ? And so far is this
 principle from promoting the cause of
 tyranny, that it is the most effectual bar
 against it. In all civil concerns, it makes
 the law the rule of obedience, and can

H

there

there be a better method of asserting the rights of the people by law, than the disowning unlawful commands by patient suffering ? The maintainers of this principle are the strongest advocates for the laws, against unbounded prerogative ; and we had a remarkable instance of it, in the magnanimous behaviour of some prelates in the last century. We are told dismal stories of the dreadful havock tyrants would make in the world, if this principle prevailed universally ; they might through lust of power destroy all their people, and reign without subjects : whereas, did this principle prevail, they would be able to make little or no havock at all ; for none of their subjects would be ready to execute their unlawful commands, and they would soon be tired of doing the business themselves. The *Tories* are not such drivellers as the Doctor takes them to be, they love liberty and property as well as their neighbours ; and as to their chearful, social disposition, the opinion of it is so well established, that it has sometimes been turned to their reproach. The nature of things is such, that

that all mankind must engage in some service or other; and the *Tories* being no friends to slavery, like that best which is easiest. There are, properly speaking, only two masters; we cannot serve both, and one of them we must serve; the choice of which we will serve, is left to ourselves, and his servants we are, to whom we obey. The *Tories* prefer that master, "whose service is perfect freedom;" the *Whigs* are of a different opinion; if they are pleased with *the wages* of their master, I can only say, I am sorry for their taste, I envy them not. It is resistance, and not passive obedience that is the slavish principle, as they will find who hold it: resistance leading naturally to a military power; the most terrible, expensive, and destructive of all power; to which they who are subject are in absolute slavery, because they have no longer the benefit of the Law; the only law in such a case, being the will of the conquering Party; as this unhappy country found to its cost under the grand usurpation of the last century.

"The duty next in importance to the rendering of obedience (as the Doctor

“ observes) is the rendering of honour to
 “ the civil magistrate.” In my remarks
 on what he has advanced under this head,
 I shall be very brief. There is, indeed,
 sufficient scope for animadversion (the
 Doctor having a “ scant measure” of
 honour, no less than of submission) but
 there is little need of it; for it having
 been fully shewn, that magistrates are to
 be obeyed as the ministers of God, it fol-
 lows of course, that, as such, they are to
 be honoured; and in depriving our author
 of his salvos for resisting them, we, at the
 same time, take from him his pleas for
 despising them. The precept for honour-
 ing Rulers, *Thou shalt not speak evil of the
 Ruler of thy people*, as well as that for sub-
 mitting to them, *Let every soul be subject
 to the higher powers*, extends not only to the
good and gentle, but to the froward also:
 if it did not, St. Paul would have had no
 reason, when the high priest commanded
 him to be smitten *contrary to the Law*,
 to acknowledge the obligation of it on
 himself at that time. Though really, let
 the Doctor’s measure be as scant as it will,
 it must be confessed, that in the testimony
 he bears to the natural disposition of Kings
 he

does them great honour; " for there had
 " never yet been a bad prince," he avers,
 " but for the flagitious flattery of bad
 " subjects." How much better is it then,
 " that the heart of the King should be
 " in the hand of the Lord, to turn whi-
 " thersoever he will," than in the hands
 of the people, to turn whithersoever they
 will! how much more for the happiness
 of the community, that he should be the
 minister of God, than the minister of the
 people! But if the Doctor thinks to com-
 promise the matter, and that by laying the
original blame on " the subjects iniquity,"
 he may traduce the Royal martyr at plea-
 sure, without censure, he is greatly mista-
 ken. Nothing can be more injurious and
 dishonourable, than to represent him as a
 tyrant, when " he had a tenderness and
 " compassion of nature which restrained
 " him from ever doing a hard-hearted
 " thing," and when none of his subjects,
 however distant from his person, were out
 of the sphere of his affection. Not, if we
 consider his unfeigned piety, his strict
 temperance, his spotless purity, his utter
 hatred of the sins of unfaithfulness, can
 any

any thing be more malicious and unjust, than the assertion, that the kind of honour by which Charles the First unhappily *lost his life* (the *REGIUS Professor's* candid phrase for his being *wickedly murdered*) was that which flattered his follies, and ministered to his vices. It was, I will allow, "the flagitious flattery of bad subjects," that brought his sacred head to the block; but then it was the flattery of those "busy mockers," who promised to make him a *glorious king*, and could devise no better way of doing it, than by giving him an opportunity, after the example of his blessed Saviour, to pray for his murderers. All I shall observe farther under this head is, that no sovereign, however good and gracious, can have the least dependence on those subjects, for the tribute of due honour, who revile the memory of such a prince as Charles the First, King and Martyr.

The great blessing of liberty, both civil and religious, which we of this nation enjoy in so eminent a degree, comes now to be considered. As to what the Doctor says in regard to Civil Liberty, I shall only
remark,

remark, that it is rather surprising he should be possessed with such an anxious " foresight of the means, by which it " may be impaired," as he professes to be; when he acknowledges so much to have been done, even in this reign, for the more effectual preservation of it. It looks really as if his fears increased, in the same proportion as the danger lessened; and he seems to have that " faintness of " heart" upon him in the land of his friends, which was to come upon the Jews in the land of their enemies; " the " found of a shaken leaf chases him, he " fleeth as fleeing from a sword, and falls " when none pursueth." He had better to my mind, dismiss these brain-sick apprehensions, take the advice of the Royal Preacher, and *in the day of prosperity be joyful.*

On the article of our religious liberty, I must beg leave to be a little more particular. That " it is a blessing which we " seem not to think of with the gratitude " we ought" I readily allow with the Doctor; for there are too many amongst us, who *use it for a cloak of maliciousness.* In
some

some other points, perhaps, we may not agree so well. "It is not (he observes) from popery alone, that we want to be secured; there may be persecution where there is no popery." Yes, there may be persecution from presbyterianism; the sufferings of the episcopal church here in the last century, and in America at this time are convincing proofs of it. And the persecution from presbyterianism is not less to be dreaded than that from popery; nor have we greater need of security from the one than from the other. To this it was natural enough to suppose our author was alluding; but it was no such thing. It is, it seems, from episcopacy and not from presbyterianism that we want to be secured; it is from that quarter he suspects "there may be persecution;" and therefore it is, he felicitates himself, that "our princes since the Revolution have very humanely forbidden the established church to look down with a domineering eye upon our dissenting brethren." But where did this faithful son of the church learn, that it was of a persecuting spirit before the Revolution? Nothing can be more contrary

contrary to its doctrines. From the beginning it claimed no temporal authority; it exercised none; and how then could it be a persecuting church? When any sect maintains principles inconsistent with the peace and good order of society, the civil magistrate, I presume, may be allowed to restrain by law the public profession of that sect; otherwise, he is the guardian of the peace, virtue, and interests of the community to little purpose. That the sects which overturned our constitution in church and state in the last century, maintained principles inconsistent with the peace and good order of society, I think can hardly be denied. To restrain such sects therefore by law, after the Restoration, under penalties in some degree proportionable to the danger threatened by them, was surely justifiable. Whatever was done in that respect was the act of the state, not of the church, and therefore the church was not answerable for it. They were, however, laid under such restrictions only as were absolutely necessary for the security of the state, and to prevent the same dismal tragedy from being acted over again, which was then so fresh in every one's

I

memory;

memory ; so that neither had the state any thing to reproach itself with on that score. But had the sufferings of the sectaries been equal to what was pretended, (which they certainly were not) there could be no plea for calling it persecution ; for that implies suffering for righteousness sake ; whereas, it was not in the cause of faith, but of faction that they suffered. And these things being considered, I do not well see how the Doctor is to be acquitted of bearing false witness against both church and state, in representing them as of a persecuting spirit.

However, " if the dissenters are still
 " compelled to contribute towards the
 " maintenance of the established clergy,"
 the professor thinks, " they should not
 " consider that circumstance as either *an*
 " *injustice*, or a *hardship*." Why, as he is
 one of the established clergy, to be sure
 they should not. Though possibly, that
 circumstance may strike him more forcibly
 than it does them ; and it may not appear
 so clear to them, that, because " it is as
 " reasonable they should be obliged to
 " contribute their quota for that purpose,
 " as for any other purpose, civil or mili-
 tary,

" tary, which they may happen to think " inexpedient," it is therefore not an injustice nor a hardship; they may think its being only as reasonable, as that which they judge unreasonable, is no recommendation of it; and that the proving it an additional hardship, is a poor inducement to them to consider it as no hardship at all.

But " they have, perhaps, much greater " reason (says the Doctor) to complain, " that they are still compelled to assent to " the doctrines of our church." This he may call *christian charity*; to me it seems more like *Laodicean lukewarmness*; for as the doctrines of our church (to the truth of which he has subscribed) are the doctrines of the gospel, is it not being extremely languid, instead of " zealously " affected in a good thing" to account it as a reasonable ground of complaint against the state, that it requires security of those who want to be teachers, that " they teach " no other doctrine?" The dissenters, however, who believe the doctrines of our church, are satisfied they have no reason to complain, that they are compelled to declare their assent to them before they commence teachers; they see the necessity

of the law requiring such subscription, and wish it not to be abrogated but continue in full force; as was evident from their petition to parliament against the repeal of it, at the time when another party petitioned for the repeal of it. And as to the dissenters, who believe them not, whatever they may think, they have really no reason to complain; for not being compelled to become teachers, they are not compelled to assent to the doctrines of the church, and therefore, let their complaints be ever so loud, they are to be little regarded.

“ The time, however, may come” (it seems) “ when the wisdom of government “ will grant them full relief.” But let us hope it will not. I must confess I should think it no proof of the Doctor’s wisdom, nor of his tender concern for the welfare, either of himself or family, to receive into his house as an instructor, and bid God speed to any one, who should claim as a natural right, the liberty of openly “ denying the Lord that bought him,” and of teaching for doctrines, that the servant is above his master, that children may be disobedient to parents, and wives not submit

mit themselves to their own husbands. Nor would it in my opinion, be any demonstration of the wisdom or goodness of government to grant full relief from all tests and subscriptions, to "these murmur-
 "ers, these complainers," of whom he speaks. For who are they? Are they not the *Priestleys* and the *Prices*, "those raging waves
 " of the sea, foaming out their own shame,
 " who despise dominion and speak evil of
 " dignities"? And of what is it they complain? Is it not that they are restrained from publicly opposing and preaching against those doctrines of the church, which are the essential doctrines of Christianity? The law was made for them; their complaint against it evinces the necessity of it; and shall that which proves its necessity be made the occasion of its repeal? "These
 " be they who separate themselves;" and if government should open wide the doors to these "mockers, walking after their un-
 " godly lusts," "to bring in", not privily, but publicly, "their damnable heresies", and propagate their monstrous opinions, it would very ill discharge the duty of administering justice, "to the punishment of
 " wickedness

“ wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God’s true religion and virtue.”

As to the Doctor’s wishing for that day to come, when *these* dissenters shall have no more occasion to say, *the fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the childrens teeth are set on edge*, I wish no less heartily than he does, that their teeth were not set on edge; but then I wish they would, for that purpose, leave off eating sour grapes. It is not because their fathers, but because they themselves have eaten the sour grapes of disobedience, that their teeth are set on edge. If they would but “ see all the sins that their fathers have done, consider them, and do not such like,” they would then acknowledge the ways of government towards them to have been equal, and their own ways unequal.

And that “ the intolerant principles of their ancestors be no more remembered to their discredit,” which the Doctor also most earnestly wishes, is it not necessary they should themselves renounce them? If they daily remind us of those intolerant principles by an open avowal of the same, and, by doing, justify the deeds of their fathers, how can we possibly forget them?
When

When we reflect, that the plan of operations they are now carrying on in America has nothing less for its object than the total extirpation of monarchy and episcopacy; and that all they who preserve inviolate their *loyalty to the King* and their *affection to the church* do therefore "endure a
 " great fight of afflictions, are spoiled of
 " their goods, have trial of cruel mock-
 " ings, yea, moreover, of bonds and im-
 " prisonment, and wander about, being
 " destitute;" what can we think of these adversaries of our Jerusalem? Must we not conclude, that they are the descendents of those unreasonable and cruel men, who declared that to tolerate the church of England would be to establish iniquity by law; that they are "the children of them who
 " killed the Prophets." So far are they, we see, from renouncing the intolerant principles and practices of their ancestors, that the avowal of them they count their greatest glory; and why then should we be backward to remember them to their shame? Nay, it will be our folly and our reproach, since we are not ignorant of their devices, so to forget them as to suffer our-
 selves

selves to become an easy prey unto their teeth.

Such, however, are the people, whose "loyalty and zeal for the protestant succession," the Professor hopes "will meet with a full reward in a complete toleration." *If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be ANATHEMA*, says the Apostle, as it stands in the common editions of the New Testament, 1 Cor. xvi. 22.—but surely, in the Doctor's copy it must be—*let him be TOLERATED*; otherwise, one should suppose, he could not think of pleading for a plenary indulgence to those men, who "denying the Lord that bought them" to be the Lord, abide not in the doctrine of Christ, but "turn religion into rebellion, and faith into faction." The dissenters, who believe the Christian verities, are content with the toleration they now enjoy, and maintain their allegiance to their sovereign; but the Protestant succession in the house of Hanover would soon come to a fearful end, if it had no better support than the loyalty and zeal of the deistical tribe of separatists, a faction ever insatiable in their demands, implacable under disappointment,
always

always tyrants when in power, and rebels when out of power. The church of England, which disclaims all resistance of the civil authority, is the best friend to the English monarchy; and the only one, as the saddest experience assures us, whose loyalty and zeal may be depended on when persecution cometh. If we examine into the conduct of our episcopal brethren in America at this time, shall we not find, that the clergy, notwithstanding the diabolical rage and malice of a schismatical republican faction, have been "instant, in season" and out of season," in exhorting those committed to their care, *to submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the King as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him—"to render to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, and honour to whom honour;"* and are not they, and their people, the faithful few, who have not swerved, in the perilous time of trial, from their duty to God and the King. These are instances indeed of loyalty and zeal for the Protestant succession! When the Doctor's charity flamed

so bright for his friends of the separation, it had not been amiss if he had expressed a wish that these our episcopal brethren might "meet with a full reward in a complete toleration". And there is abundant reason to believe, that if, instead of courting Whigs and dissenters, and fearing to offend a party, "whom no King could ever govern, and no God could ever please," proper encouragement had been given to the church of England in America, and episcopacy long ago settled among them, as they had a right to expect, better principles would have been disseminated throughout the Colonies, the present unnatural rebellion had been prevented, and the Americans might still have been a willing and obedient people.

But whatever may have been the case in times past, it is to be hoped our rulers will now see the things which belong unto their peace; and that the wretched policy of obliging enemies who will never be gained by indulgence, at the expence of friends who may be lost by neglect, will not prevail in future. That rebellion will not be considered as a necessary qualification for any place of trust in government;

nor

nor disobedience a principal recommendation to his Majesty's service. That they shall not be thought the most fit to have the King for their master, who maintain that he is their servant; nor they the properest persons to guard the throne, who are as ready, on the least disgust, to guard the scaffold. In respect to the Colonies, it is evident, I think, beyond contradiction, that to secure their obedience, no way can be so effectual as a regular establishment of the church of England, with resident bishops; and an exclusion of dissenters from a share in the Civil government. Till the people are better instructed in the duty of Christian subjection, they will be prone to rebel; and if the restless faction, which have been the authors of the present disturbances, are permitted to possess any considerable branch of power, it will enable them to disturb the government; and the constitution, as well ecclesiastical as civil, will be in perpetual danger from them. As therefore, the establishment of the episcopal church in America, and the exclusion of dissenters from places of trust, are so essential to the

peace of the whole empire, every sincere friend to the real interest both of Great Britain and America, will wish that these points may be duly attended to in the new settlement of the Colony governments, necessarily to take place, if it shall please God to crown his Majesty's arms with that success, for which every faithful subject (and the Professor, I trust, among the rest) most ardently prays.

* But lest " I should weary out your
 " patience (if I have not done it already)
 " to say nothing of my own," or of Dr.
Watson's (for certainly as I have taken the
 pains to read his performance, he will be
 so polite as to read mine) I will now con-
 clude my remarks. " I may not probably
 " have convinced him, that he is wrong
 " in any thing which he has advanced ;"
 " or that the" scripture " authorities he
 " has quoted, will not support him in
 " the inferences he has drawn from
 " them" in favour of resistance ; " yet,

* See an Apology for Christianity, in a Series of Letters addressed to Edward Gibbon Esq. by Richard Watson, D. D. F. R. S. p. 199, 200, 201.

" I may

" I may perhaps have had the good for-
 " tune to lessen, in the minds of others,"
 some of that prejudice against the Revo-
 lution, " some of that dislike to the
 Christian" doctrine of Passive Obedience,
 " which the perusal of his sermon had un-
 " happily excited." " Sorry shall I be,
 " if what I have written, should give the
 " least interruption to the prosecution of
 " any work" of the same nature with *the*
Apology for Christianity, "in which he may
 be engaged;" but very happy should I be
 to prevent his dabbling any more in poli-
 tics; for I must confess I cannot carry my
 complaisance to him so far as he does to
 Mr. Gibbon; and, in my opinion, he has
 rather exceeded in the measure, since he
 certainly would have more reason to rejoice
 than be sorry for interrupting the prosecu-
 tion of a work, which has a tendency, as
 he observes, " to excite in the minds of its
 " readers a dislike to the Christian religion."
 " The world is now possessed of the opi-
 " nion of us both, upon the subject" of
 government; and possibly we may one way
 or other come to be possessed of its opinion
 of us. It is a complaint of Lord *Clarendon*,
 in his Dialogue concerning Education,
 " that

" that too many of the great men in his
 " time being without that affection and
 " zeal for the government of the church
 " that they ought to have had, cast an im-
 " putation of debauchery on our Universi-
 " ties, that they might have an excuse for
 " sending their sons to those places abroad,
 " where they sucked in all manner of poi-
 " son against the civil as well as against the
 " ecclesiastical government, the government
 " in all the places where those seminaries
 " were, being merely popular." Had his
 lordship lived in our days, he might have
 made the same complaint; but had he seen
 the Professor's two sermons, his opinion pos-
 sibly would have been, that our great men
 need not be at the trouble of sending their
 sons to seminaries abroad, for the purpose
 of " sucking in all manner of poison against
 " our civil and ecclesiastical governments."
 Be that as it may, the world, as I said be-
 fore, is now possessed of the opinion of us
 both on the subject, and the Doctor may
 have his reasons why " it may be proper
 " for us both to leave it in this state," " The
 " almost insuperable reluctance we feel to
 " bandying of abusive argument, and not
 " any backwardness to acknowledge our
 " mistakes,

"mistakes," must be supposed to be the
 motive with us both. "It is not, in
 "good truth, a difficult task, to chastise
 "the froward petulance of those, who
 "mistake personal invective for reason-
 "ing, and clumsy banter for ingenuity,"
 but then it is a disagreeable one; though
 I cannot think with the Doctor, that,
 "it is a dirty business at best, and should
 "never be undertaken by a man of any
 "temper, except when the interests of
 "truth may suffer by his neglect;" for,
 in my judgment, it should be underta-
 ken only by men of temper; and when
 it is to serve the interests of truth, it is
 surely by no means a dirty business.
 Had I the Doctor's talents and temper,
 I should have no objection to the task
 upon occasion, and if he has met with any
 of that froward petulance he mentions,
 he would do well to chastise it, "for
 "the rod and reproof give wisdom;"
 but then let him first be very sure,
 that the error is not on his side; that
 he has not mistaken reasoning for per-
 sonal invective, and ingenuity for clumsy
 banter; lest, instead of chastising others,
 he be found only to prepare a rod for his
 own back.

(72)

I rely on your goodness, my dear friend,
to excuse my having been so tardy in com-
plying with your request,

And am,

Ever your's,

7 JUL 68

Just Published, Price 1s.

THE SECOND EDITION.

S T R I C T U R E S
O N

DR. WATSON'S RESTORATION SERMON.

Printed and sold by J. Woodyer, at Cambridge; D. Prince,
at Oxford; B. White, T. Payne, T. Cadell, and G. Robinson,
London.

Of whom may be had,

A T R E A T I S E
O N T H E
NATURE and CONSTITUTION
O F T H E
CHRISTIAN CHURCH,

And also,

A D I S C O U R S E
O N T H E
ENGLISH CONSTITUTION,

Extracted from a late Eminent Writer,
And Applicable to the present Times;